

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-3, 13, 15 and 16 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 11-17 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116:

Applicant request entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because the amendment do not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised. The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) states, in §714.12, that "any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Further, MPEP §714.13 sets forth that "the Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The MPEP further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

In the Office Action, at page 3, numbered paragraph 9, claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that an applet "having a single-program structure" is enabled in the specification at least in Figure 10 and at page 7, lines 16-19. Further, such features are supported in the specification at least at page 17, lines 14-20. For example, an applet having a single-program structure is supported at least by the phrase "realizing the update of the version of the applet in the process of the applet itself." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

In the Office Action, at page 4, numbered paragraphs 11-12, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11,12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This

rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 3, which have been amended to recite "updating an applet at the branch office terminal unit when the comparison unit outputs a non-matching result." Further, these claims have been amended to recite that "the applet at the branch office terminal unit is deleted and the applet of the latest version is retrieved when the applet at the branch office terminal unit is terminated." Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claims 1 and 3 overcome the Examiner's rejections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, at pages 4-16, numbered paragraph 14, claims 1-9 and 11-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,360,366 to Heath, et al. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites "reading the version number of the applet of the latest version from the version number storage unit of the central office server when a predetermined event occurs," in which "the predetermined event includes at least one of an initialization of the applet or a detection of a user event causing performance of an online process during execution after the applet is initialized." Support for this amendment is filed in the originally-filed specification at least at page 11, line 20 to page 12, line 10. Independent claims 2, 3, 13, 15, and 16 have been amended to include similar features.

As an advantage, in a non-limiting example, the applet is updated at a branch office terminal unit whenever the applet is initialized or when a user performs an event while the applet is executing that causes an online, thus increasing efficiency of applet version update.

In contrast, Heath, et al. at col. 6, lines 38-56 teaches only that "a user may either invoke at 406 an icon directly associated with the application program or run the launcher program at 407 to select a particular application program to update," which is different from updating an applet when detecting "a user event causing performance of an online process during execution after the applet is initialized," as recited in the amended independent claims 1, 2, 3, 13, 15, and 16.

Moreover, amended independent claim 1 recites "the applet at the branch office terminal unit is deleted and the applet of the latest version is retrieved when the applet at the branch office terminal unit is terminated," support for which is found in the originally filed specification at least at page 16, lines 11-18. Independent claims 3, 13, 15, and 16 have also been amended to

recite similar features.

As an advantage, in a non-limiting example, an applet is automatically updated whenever it is terminated, thus increasing the efficiency of updating.

In contrast, Heath, et al. at col. 6, lines 6-56 only teaches updating an application when a launcher is engaged, but does not discuss or suggest deleting an applet and retrieving a latest version of the applet when the applet is terminated.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 3, 13, 15, and 16 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Heath, et al.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

September 1, 2004

By:

David M. Pitcher
David M. Pitcher
Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501